DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 434 CS 503 609

AUTHOR Droge, David; Davis, Kristine
TITLE In Search of the Campaign Fan: Media Use and Caucus Participation in the 1980 Primary Campaign.
PUB DATE May 81
NOTE 41p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (31st, Minneapolis, MN, May 21-25, 1981). Not available in paper copy due to marginal legibility of original document.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; *Citizen Participation; *Communication Research; *Mass Media; Media Research; Political Attitudes; *Political Influences; Political Power; *Politics; Reading Habits; Television Viewing
IDENTIFIERS Iowa; *Media Use; *Political Campaigns

ABSTRACT

High turnout for the 1980 Iowa caucuses and conflicting explanations for that high turnout formed the background for an investigation of the relationship between media uses and gratifications, involvement in the local community, and caucus participation. Campaign fan gratifications--either excitement seeking or communicative utility--were hypothesized as being unrelated to political activity. A random sample of 46 caucus participants and nonparticipants in the state precinct caucuses was surveyed. Results indicated that caucus participants were more active in local and presidential politics, more involved in the local community, paid more attention to newspaper information content, and were more likely than nonparticipants to watch television programs that featured political candidates. Campaign fan gratifications were not involved in differentiating participants from nonparticipants. Thus, the campaign fan hypothesis remained unconfirmed. (Author/RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED208434

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

IN SEARCH OF THE CAMPAIGN FAN:

MEDIA USE AND CAUCUS PARTICIPATION IN THE 1980 PRIMARY CAMPAIGN

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David Droge

Kristine Davis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

David Droge and
Kristine Davis,
University of Puget Sound
1500 N. Warner
Tacoma, WA 98405
(206) 756-3334

submitted to the Political Communication Division, International Communication Association, for consideration for the 31st Annual Conference, Minneapolis, May 1981

CS036609

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Observers of the American political system lament consistently the decline of voter participation in the electoral process. The 54% turnout rate of November, 1976, gives a solid basis for their concern (Witcover, 1977, 644). That voter participation in earlier stages of the campaign is much below the 50% mark is well known; campaign managers plan strategies based on estimates of 30% turnout for primaries and 10% for caucuses.

We have no quarrel with the fact that many Americans do not vote. At the foundation of this study, however, was a dissatisfaction with the common notion that the electorate is composed of only two distinct groups: (1) the few politically active voters who are interested in and attentive to campaign communication, and (2) the many apathetic and alienated persons who ignore and avoid political discourse. This bifurcation of the American populace is easily congruent with the "functional-reality-informational" and "consummatory-pleasure-fantasist-escapist" dichotomy of media gratifications criticized by Katz, Blumler, and Gurevitch (1974) as "to broad to be serviceable." Its oversimplified value judgment is readily apparent.

We saw a need, therefore, to transcend this either/or dichotomy which suggested that people either use media to help them make political decisions or they are alienated from political media content. Two perspectives support the attempted transcendence. Chaffee(1972) opens his discussion of the interpersonal context of mass communication with the observation that we frequently attend to media "for information and insights that we can employ in our interactions with others." He goes on to review the finding (Chaffee & McLoed, 1967) that voters

were more likely to ask for campaign pamphlets if they expected to talk about the election with friends. Thus is identified a functional use of campaign media other than vote guidance. Carey and Frieling (1974), in their attack on "reality content" versus "fantasy content" in mass media suggest that consumption cannot always be equated with passive escape. Rather, they discuss an active "consummatory moment" which is immediately pleasurable and self-contained in the consuming experience. This contention is congruent with Weaver's (1976) notion that television reporting transforms the Presidential primary campaign into a "melodrama." Individuals may actively attend to political media because of its excitement or entertainment value while not becoming politically active in the campaign.

Our review of this and other uses and gratifications research, studies on voter turnout, and media criticism suggested the possibility of an additional campaign gratification of campaign media—one applicable particularly, though not exclusively, to members of the nonvoting populace who talk about the campaign with others and/or play an attentive spectator role. We hypothesized that this gratification is both functional and consummatory, one sought by individuals we call "campaign fans." In this study we attempted to characterize this gratification and its interaction with political participation by: (1) identifying differential uses and gratifications of media between voters and non-voters, (2) investigating the role of interpersonal interaction in the political activity of voters and nonvoters, and (3) delineating relevant attitudinal differences between voters and nonvoters

The campaign fan hypothesis is supported by a varied collection of

prior research. Becker (1979), in analyzing four studies of political gratifications, reported that several items are supported consistently by audience surveys: surveillance and vote guidance, reinforcement seeking, excitement seeking, and communication utility. Subjects report that they avoid political media for reasons of relaxation, alienation, and perceived bias. When factor analyzed, these elements tend to cluster into three groups: surveillance(surveillance and vote guidance), excitement (excitement seeking, reinforcement seeking, and communication utility), and media avoidance. Effects of these factors on political activity are offered by McLoed and Becker (1974): surveillance is associated with increased activity and high interest; the excitement dimension is less clear, but appears generally associated with lesser activity and high interest; and the avoidance items, as might be expected, are associated generally with low activity and low interest.

Further understanding of the role of interest in motivating persons to attention or action can be gained from Ashenfelter and Kelley (1975). They suggest that interest in a campaign--a product of its recreational or entertainment value--does not have a major impact on voter turnout; high interest in a campaign increased the probebility of voting by only .10-.14. Finally, Grunig (1979) clarifies the relationship between attention and media use in reporting that when people perceive situations as involving them, they seek media information; when media information when media information is not perceived as having a functional relationship to situations which involve them, people passively consume that media content. To the extent that discussion of the campaign with others--the communication utility gratification--is perceived as involving by individuals, we can expect them to be functional consumers of campaign

media. Such attention to the campaign, however, does not seem to be the prime catalyst to voter turnout.

Because we were interested specifically in voter turnout for caucuses, rather than primary elections, we felt a need to explore additional factors relevant to interpersonal interaction. Attendance at caucuses, promoted by political parties as "havens of grassroots democracy" and "opportunities for social interaction," demands a stronger commitment than does dtepping into a voting booth and pulling a lever; voters must commit themselves to interaction with their neighbors. We hypothesized, therefore, that "psychological dispositions, sociological factors, and environmental conditions" not only determine audiences' use of media (Katz, Blumler, & Gurevitch, 1974) but also help determine voters' likelihood of attending caucuses. Two areas of research support this relationship. One, the study of individuals' sense of community, contains several relevant findings. Persons likely to engage in interpersonal interaction with members of their community are those who score high on measures of neighboring preference and safety (Doolittle & Fitzpatrick, 1978). They are not likely, however, to become involved in formal community organizations (Doolittle and McDonald, 1978). Campaign fans, as we have described them thus far, would seem to fall within this group. Persons who are more involved in formal organizations—a category that would include the politically active voter—tend to score high on pro-urbanism and communicate more with individuals outside their immediate neighborhoods than with those within them (Crenson, 1978; Riley & Riley, 1951). Placed within the framework of caucus participation, we expected that politically active voters would attend regardless of their sense of community; they would be exercising their political duty. Likelihood of less politically active persons who exhibit a high sense

of neighborhood involvement is less clear. The romantic conception of precinct caucuses as meetings of neighbors deciding who will be the Presidential nominee suggests that persons with a high preference for informal interaction would attend caucuses for their social interaction component. The likelihood, however, that caucuses would be composed of politically active--and less neighborhood-oriented--citizens could dilute the attractiveness of the social exchange.

This scenario is incomplete, however, because we have yet to consider the relationship between political alienation and sense of community. Philliber (1977) reports that people tend to subjectively group bureaucratic aspects of society together--political alienation, police alienation, and consumer alienation were not found to be distinct factors--but do not generalize these negative feelings to their neighbors. Thus, we can characterize people as socially and/or politically alienated. (Giffin, 1970; McLoed, Ward, & Tancill, 1965). This distinction allowed us to make some additional predictions concerning caucus participation. We have already noted that the politically active will attend regardless of social orientation. We know that the politically alienated participate less in election processes because they doubt their participation would have any noticeable impact (Wright, 1976). This sense of helplessness has been identified by Olsen (1969) as noe of two distinct types of alienation. The other type of political alienation, discontentment or cynicism, is not associated with voting behavior. Although we would not expect helpless persons to attend caucuses, the participation of discontented individuals may be mediated by their preference for interaction with their neighbors. Persons who are discontented but score high in neighboring prefernce and desire for informal interaction may attend caucuses, depending on the prospect for rewarding social interaction.

Persons who are cynical about the political system and estranged from their community might stop by an election booth, but would probably avoid attending a caucus because of its more social orientation. Despite their interest in the campaign, they may stay away because of the prospect of spending hours haggling with neighbors with whom they have had little contact.

Both of these sets of voters, however, might be expected to use campaign media in search of a gratification which transcends the functional (surveillance-vote guidance) and passive consumption (media avoidance) dichotomy. The critical predictor of caucus attendance among these individuals, then, is whether they report greater seeking of excitement (associated with active consumption of media content) or greater seeking of communication utility (identified as a functional use of media). In either case, they fall within the purview of the campaign fan hypothesis.

The Washington caucuses provide a particularly fitting environment in which to investigate this hypothesis. First, the caucuses, which occurred on March 11, 1980, were far enough into the campaign season to escape the attention given to the Florida and Iowa gatherings. In addition, the caucuses were overshadowed nationally by three state primaries held on the same day (Alabama, Florida, and Georgia). Thus, voters were not likely either to be "socialized" into attending caucuses by extensive media coverage or to be motivated to turn out by the potential media impact of their decisions. Second, Washington was not perceived as a major campaign battleground. Unlike Iowa, candidates aired no advertisements prior to the caucuses. Promotion of turnout thus depended on local political organizations and routine campaign coverage by the news media. Third, Washington caucuses operate independently of state laws; voters receive no official notification concerning candidates or caucus procedures. Diffusion of such information depends on the efforts of

local party activists and the cooperation of local newspapers in listing caucus locations. In short, we believed that the Washington caucuses allowed good possibilities for insight into the interaction of media use, interpersonal influence, and voter participation--insight which would be generalizable to most of the twenty-three states which use caucuses to elect 27% of the country's national convention delegates.

STUDY DESIGN

Since a major purpose of this study was to discover differences in media uses and gratifications between caucus participants and non-participants, it was necessary to generate a pool of respondents from each group. During the week before the Washington caucuses, trained student interviewers contacted households in Pierce County and asked to interview registered voters at home at that time. This sample was obtained from a list of telephone numbers generated randomly by computer. The initial telephone survey yielded a pool of 217 respondents, of whom 127 indicated that they definitely or probably would not attend a caucus. Approximately one month later, immediately after the county caucuses, these respondents were again contacted by telephone for more extensive interviews. The length of the second interview (approximately 20-25 minutes), however, resulted in a high attrition rate. Of the original sample, 47 (37%) non-participants completed the second interview.

List of precinct caucus participants were obtained from both Democratic and Republican party executives in the county. Precincts were selected at random, and every participant in these selected precincts was contacted and asked to participate in the extended interview. 46 participants (23 who attended Republican caucuses, and 23 who attended Democratic caucuses) completed these interviews.

In addition to requests for demographic information, the extended interview contained four sets of measures. First, items used during the 1972 and 1976 Presidential campaigns to assess uses of mass media, campaign gratifications and avoidances, political activity, and campaign interest were included (cf. McLoed & Becker, 1974; McLoed, Durall, Ziemke, & Bybee, 1979). Second, an abbreviated form of the Sense of Community scale (Doolittle & Fitzpatrick, 1978) was used. Four items were selected from each of the factors comprising this scale. Third, Olsen's (1969) Political Alienation scale was utilized. This scale measures Cynicism and Helplessness as two distinct types of alienation. Finally, a series of items developed specifically for this study assessed attitudes toward caucuses, participant satisfaction, ease of locating caucuses, and preference for a Presidential primary rather than a caucus system. Table 1 lists items selected from the Sense of Community scale and the items developed for this survey.

RESULTS

CHARACTERISTICS OF ACHIEVED SAMPLE

Women constituted 57% of this sample, and men 43%. Mean length of residence in Pierce County was 22.6 years, and mean education level was 14.6 years, or slightly above the college sophomore level. Additional demographic characteristics of this sample are presented in Table 2. In general, women and retired individuals were over-represented in this sample because of the method of data collection (telephoning individuals at home on weekday evenings). The disproportionately high percentage of teachers represented in this sample is a reflection of the active role teachers' organizations played in the 1980 Presidential primaries.

Strict adherence to random sampling procedures in this survey, however, supports the claim that the achieved sample represents the population of potential caucus participants. Indeed, analysis of the preliminary survey yielded surprisingly accurate results. Not only did this initial survey duplicate caucus attendance patterns exactly--6% of our sample said they would attend caucuses, and the actual attendance rate for the county was 6%--but expressed candidate preference of this sample also replicated the preferences of caucus participants. In short, there is reason to believe that the achieved sample is an accurate representation of the population of caucus participants and non-participants in Pierce County.

ITEM ANALYSIS

1. Media use items

In order to estimate the underlying dimensionality of both newspaper and television uses, separate factor analyses were performed. The analyses were designed to determine common orthogonal factors underlying the raw scores. The number of factors was established to ensure that only factors accounting for at least the amount of variance of a single item were included in the final solution. Varimax rotation was used.

Three-factor solutions for both newspaper uses and television uses were produced. Factor loadings are displayed in Table 3 and Table 4. One noteworthy difference emerges. For both newspaper and television uses the first factor clearly is an Information cluster. For newspaper use, the second factor represents an Entertainment cluster, while sports is isolated in the third cluster. For television uses, however, sports events is clustered with movies and crime and adventure shows to form

an Action Entertainment factor, while situation comedies and music and variety shows together constitute a Light Entertainment factor. This population considers stories about sports as different from other newspaper content, but views sports events as akin to other forms of action entertainment when watching television.

2. Gratifications and avoidances

A similar factor analysis was conducted on the campaign gratifications and avoidances items. Results of this analysis duplicate substantially the factors uncovered by Becker (1979). As revealed in Table 5, the first factor is an Avoidances cluster, including six of the seven Avoidance items. The second factor is a Surveillance factor, the third Excitement Seeking, and the fourth a Reinforcement Seeking Cluster. The fifth factor represents the only deviation from Becker's findings. This factor seems to be a Communicative Utility factor containing two items. Using political campaigns to gain information to use in political discussions has a high positive loading, and avoiding television programs that feature political candidates because "they hardly ever have anything to say" loads negatively. A clear relationship between candidates' statements and potential political discussions exists, indicating that content, rather than excitement, is associated with interpersonal interaction. Separating gratifications from avoidances, however, yielded different results. Although not included in tabular form, a factor analysis of the Avoidance items alone revealed only one factor which met the minimum criterion. Analysis of gratifications alone is presented in Table 6. The same items comprise a Surveillance factor and a Reinforcement Seeking factor as in the previous analysis. In this analysis, however, Communicative Utility clusters with the Excitement Seeking items. Hence

gratifications and avoidances seem to be related only in the Communicative Utility of political content, but identify separate dimensions when considered independently of one another.

3. Sense of community

Reliability estimates using coefficient alpha (Cronbach, 1951) for each of the sub-scales of the Sense of Community measure were:

Safety	.65
Informal Interaction	.86
Localism	.49
Pro-Urbanism	.29
Neighboring Preference	.59

Since these sub-scales were derived empirically, these reliability coefficients appear reasonable in all cases but one. The Pro-Urbanism scale is unacceptable. A factor analysis of the Sense of Community scale (not reported here) revealed that the Pro-Urbanism scale actually contained two factors, one encompassing a desire for Anonymity, and the other cluster contained two items which asked about problems with the noise of urban environments. These two new sub-scales were included in the next phase of the analysis.

4. Correlations among scales

Based on the preceding factor analyses, new variables were constructed by summing the raw scores of each of the items included in a factor. The pattern of correlations among these new variables is reported in Table 7. The patterns seem intuitively plausible. Of particular interest are the positive correlations between Localism, Informal Interaction, Newspaper Information Content, and Surveillance. Newspaper Information also is negatively associated with Television Action Entertainment Content

and avoidance of campaign programming.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PARTICIPANTS AND NON-PARTICIPANTS

Table 8 summarizes the results of a series of t-tests conducted on variables included in this survey. Many variables expected to discriminate between participants and non-participants revealed no differences. In particular, Campaign Gratifications, Primary Preference, and Political Alienation did not discriminate between these two groups. For all respondents, however, the Cynicism score was significantly higher than the Helplessness score (Cynicism mean=2.65;Helplessness mean=1.33; t=10.13, degrees of freedom=92; probability=.000). Both participants and non-participants were cynical about politics in general, but did not feel politically helpless.

Six sets of variables demonstrated significant differences at the p=.05 level. First, reported involvement in both local political activity and presidential campaign activity was higher for caucus participants. Second, scores on the Safety, Localism, and Informal Interaction subscales of the Sense of Community measure were higher for participants. Third, caucus participants reported that they read newspapers more frequently and paid more attention to Newspaper Information content. Fourth, non-participants watched more television, paid more attention to Action Entertainment programming, and were more likely to avoid programming which featured political candidates. Fifth, caucus participants were generally older, had lived in Pierce County longer, and had more education than non-participants. Finally, participants found caucuses easier to locate and were less likely to agree with the statement "Only people who are strongly committed to a candidate attend caucuses" than non-participants.

Since 90% of all respondents reported that they had been paying "some"

or "a lot" of attention to the primary campaign, these two scale points were examined using Chi-square analysis. Table 9 reveals that participants were more likely to indicate they had been paying a lot of attention to the primary campaign. In addition, caucus participants were more likely to read news magazines than were non-participants.

PREDICTORS OF CAUCUS ATTENDANCE

A major task of the present study was to uncover the strongest differences between caucus participants and non-participants. In particular, it was necessary to examine the possible confounding effects of demographic characteristics such as age and education on the relationship between pattern of media use, political activity, and caucus attendance. Ashenfelter and Kelley(1975) found that education level was the single most powerful predictor of voter turnout. In order to ascertain the strongest differences between the group which attended caucuses and the group which did not attend, a series of multiple regression analyses was conducted, with Caucus Attendance serving as a dichotomous dependent variable. Tatsuoka (1971) notes that discriminant function analysis, the more powerful multivariate method for predicting group membership from a series of variables, reduces to multiple regression in the special case of two groups.

Three sets of regression analyses were conducted. First, a series of step-wise regression analyses examining the predictive power of each set of discriminators is reported in Table 10. As predictor sets, Newspaper Use, Television Use, Attitudes Towards Caucuses, and Demographic differences seem to be equally powerful (explaining 24%, 23%, 23%, and 24% of total variance in Caucus Attendance respectively), while Sense of

Community is a weak predictor, accounting for only 11% of variance. Combining media use variables improved the discriminating power to 35% of the variance explained. Apparently media use is a more powerful set of discriminators than Political Activity, which accounted for 31% of total variance.

Second, the impact of Education, Political Involvement, and Television Uses are reported in Table 11. Step-wise regression uses magnitude of the zero-order correlation between independent and dependent variable as a criterion to determine which variable to enter into the equation first, and magnitude of partial correlation of the remaining variables at each step to determine the order of inclusion of each succeeding variable. When independent variables are correlated with one another, however, the contribution of each variable may be confounded. To combat this problem of multicollinearity, a heirarchical design allows a priori specification of the order of inclusion of variable sets in the equation. In this instance Education was "forced" into the regression equation at the first step to examine the effect of other variables on Caucus Attendance once Education had been included. In the heirarchical design Education accounted for 14% of total variance in Caucus Attendance, Political Inovlvement measures accounted for another 21%, and Television Uses another 5%. Further, the step-wise design indicates that Education is a relatively weak discriminator when considered in conjunction with Political Involvement and Television Use, accounting for only 1% of variance in Caucus Attendance.

Finally, a step-wise regression equation which involves the "best" predictors of Attendance is described in Table 12. This set of discriminators accounted for 58% of total variance. Not surprisingly, the strongest differences between caucus participants and non-participants were in Political Involvement in the Presidential campaign and the relative ease with which individuals could locate their own precinct caucuses.

believing that commitment to a candidate was not a precondition for attendance and attending to Newspaper Information Content were less powerful. Not avoiding television programs which featured political candidates and length of residence in Pierce County contributed slightly to the discriminatory power of this equation, while the contribution of Involvement in Local Politics hours spent watching television, and Education were negligible.

DISCUSSION

We believe we have isolated important differences between caucus participants and non-participants. Our quest for the "campaign fan," however, remains unfulfilled. Our results indicate that different patterns of media use are secondary in importance to active involvement in primary campaign activity in identifying the small minority of voters who attended precinct caucuses. Within the set of media uses and gratifications examined in this study, attention to public affairs information content in newspapers and television programs which feature political candidates were more powerful in discriminating between participants and non-participants than was the amount of time spent watching television. Attention to action entertainment programming, a factor which might identify campaign fans, was statistically significant in differentiating between these two groups. This use of television, however, had a negligible impact in discriminating between these two groups. Involvement in local politics similarly was a more potent discriminator than perceived safety or amount of informal interaction with neighbors in an individual's community. In this study both political alienation measures and campaign gratification measures failed to discriminate between participants and non-participants.

Attention to the Presidential primary campaign for consummatory or interactive reasons is tied more to the content of campaign coverage than to its "melodramatic" form. Campaign fans may also be active politically. We could find no evidence that excitement seeking or communicative utility were associated with viewing the campaign for non-political purposes. The fact that political activity was such a powerful predictor, and that caucus attendance seems to be one political behavior in the life of a small minority of politically active and informed voters, leads us, reluctantly, to conclude that the campaign fan might exist, but his or her behavior is not associated with caucus attendance. Further, we suggest that the caucus system serves only those who are previously involved in political activity, and is not a force for political socialization in the state of Washington.

REFERENCES

Ashtenfelter, O. & Kelley, S. Determinants of participation in presidential elections. Journal of Law and Economics, 18: 695-734. 1975

Becker, L. Measurement of gratifications. Communication Research, 6: 54-73. 1979

Carey, J. W., & Krieling, A. Popular culture and uses and gratifications: Notes toward an accomodation. In Blumler, J. & Katz, E. The Uses of Mass Communication. Berkeley: Sage, 1974.

Chaffee, S. The interpersonal context of mass communication. In G. Kline & P. Tichenor. Current Perspectives in Mass Communication Research. Berkeley: Sage, 1972.

Chaffee, S., & McLoed, J. Communication as so-orientation: two studies. Presented to the Association for Education in Journalism, Boulder, Colorado, 1967.

Crenson, M. Social networks and political processes in urban neighborhoods. American Journal of Political Science, 22: 578-94. 1978

Cronbach, L. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika, 16: 297-334. 1951

Doolittle, R., & Fitzpatrick, M. Neighboring in the urban milieu: An examination of communication and sense of community. Unpublished paper, University of Wisconsis-Milwaukee. 1978.

Doolittle, R., & McDonald, D. Communication and a sense of community in a metropolitan neighborhood: A factor analytic examination. Communication Quarterly, 26: 2-7. 1978

Giffin, K. Social alienation by communication denial. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 56: 347-57.

Grunig, J. Time budgets, level of involvement, and the use of the mass media. Journalism Quarterly, 56: 248-61. 1979

Katz, E., Blumler, J., & Gurevitch, M. Utilization of mass communication by the individual. In Blumler, J., & Katz, E. The Uses of Mass Communication. Berkeley: Sage, 1974.

McLoed, J., & Becker, L. Testing the validity of gratification measures through political effects analysis. In Blumler, J., & Katz, E. The Uses of Mass Communication. Berkeley: Sage, 1974.

McLoed, J., Ward, S., & Tancier, K. Alienation and uses of public media. Public Opinion Quarterly, 829: 583-94. 1965.

Olsen, M. Political alienation. Social Forces, 47: 288-99. 1969.

Phillibor, W. Patterns of alienation in inner city ghettoes. Human Relations, 30: 303-10. 1977

Riley, M., & Riley, J. A sociological approach to communications research. Public Opinion Quarterly, 15: 445-60. 1951

Weaver, P. Captives of melodrama. New York Times Magazine, Aug. 19, 1976.

Witcover, J. Marathon: The pursuit of the presidency. New York: Viking. 1977.

Wright, J. Alienation and political negativism: new evidence from national surveys. Sociological and Social Research, 60: 111-34. 1976

Table 1

Sense of Community and Caucus Satisfaction Items

Scale values: 5 = Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = undecided;
2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree

SENSE OF COMMUNITY

Safety

This is an especially good neighborhood for retired people to live.

This is an especially good neighborhood for adults to live.

This is an especially good neighborhood for raising teenagers.

This is an especially safe neighborhood for children under 12 years old to play out-of-doors.

Informal Interaction

People in this neighborhood visit me frequently.

I know most of my neighbors well enough to call them by their first names.

I know most of my neighbors well enough to call on them in their homes.

I know most of my neighbors well enough to spend a whole morning or afternoon visiting with them.

Localism

I feel I have frequent opportunities to exert influence on those people who make decisions about the quality of life in this part of the city.

I feel that the residents of this neighborhood are effectively represented in local units of government by the elected officials from this area.

I frequently attend meetings of local, neighborhood organizations or associations.

Pro-Urbanism

I would like to live in a large city because neighbors and aquaintances there would probably be less concerned about my private life.

I would not like to live in a small town because there is too much gossip about your private life.

It is important to me to have a house away from the noise of traffic.

The constant noise of modern, urban life is really rather exciting to me.

Neighboring Preference

I want my neighbors to feel that they can drop in at my house any time they like.

I really enjoy being able to lend things to neighbors.

I would like to live in a neighborhood where residents do things together now and then.

Although I occasionally enjoy talking to my neighbors, I don't like to get very involved with them.

ATTITUDES TOWARD CAUCUSES

The Washington caucus system is an effective way to select delegates.

The Washington caucus system is a fair method for selecting delegates.

Only people who are strongly committed to a candidate attend caucuses.

Caucuses are a good example of democracy at work.

Political parties make it difficult to find out where caucuses are meeting.

CAUCUS PARTICIPANT SATISFACTION

My caucus was run poorly.

Attending the caucus helped me to learn more about campaign issues.

Attending the caucus helped me to learn more about the presidential candidates.

I'm glad I went to the caucus meeting.

EASE OF ACCESS

How difficult was it for you to find out where your caucus was located?

PRIMARY PREFERENCE

Would you prefer that Washington have a primary election rather than caucus meetings?
5 = yes; 4 = maybe; 3 = undecided; 2 = not really; 1 = no

TABLE 2

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

Age

18 to 25	16%
26 to 39	30
40 to 65	35
Over 65	19

Income

Under $5000	9%
5000 to 15000	29
15000 to 25000	26
Over 25000	36

Marital status

Married	70%
Divorced/Separated	18
Widowed	5
Single	8

Occupation

Business profession	18%
Homemaker	18
Retired	16
Teaching profession	15
Government service (civilian)	9
Skilled labor	8
Service profession	5
Self Employed	4
Student	4
Government service (military)	3

Table 3

FACTOR LOADINGS

NEWSPAPER EXPOSURE ITEMS

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Local and State politics	.72	.10	-.02
National government and politics	.90	-.06	.05
Interesting people	.07	.35	.01
Crime and accidents	.00	.48	.09
International affairs	.59	.02	.19
Sports	.08	.00	.64
Editorials	.31	.29	-.04
Advertisements	-.03	.49	-.09

Highest Factor Loadings are underlined.

Table 4

FACTOR LOADINGS

TELEVISION EXPOSURE FACTORS

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
National news broadcasts	.82	.15	-.05
Movies	.10	.46	.26
Local news broadcasts	.77	.21	.12
Crime and adventure shows	.07	.72	-.06
News specials and documentaries	.41	.05	.24
Situation comedies	.03	.06	.77
Music & variety shows	.20	.18	.26
Sports events	.20	.34	.15

Highest Factor Loadings are underlined.

TABLE 5

Factor Loadings

Campaign Gratifications and Avoidances

Gratifications	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
Stands on issues	-.05	.79	.01	.11	.12
Personal qualities	-.04	.36	.17	.19	.01
Help make up mind	-.07	.65	.20	.22	.01
Judge who is likely to win	.13	.11	.39	.15	-.08
Candidate's strong points	.20	.27	.22	.36	.10
Something to talk about	-.07	-.05	.84	.01	.14
Enjoy excitement	.07	-.08	.41	.01	.31
What candidates would do if elected	.18	.20	.08	.38	.36
Use in political discussions	-.12	.19	.28	.06	.53
Get information which agrees with your position	-.06	.20	.26	.41	.19
Judge candidates' weak points	-.06	.27	-.00	.87	-.08
Avoidances					
Not interested in politics	.53	.02	-.04	.12	-.10
Mind made up	.38	-.01	-.02	-.10	-.01

TABLE 5
(continued)

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
Prefer to relax	.51	.21	.09	.12	-.25
Can't trust what politicians tell you	.58	-.22	.09	.12	-.45
Some candidates talk down to audience	.80	-.12	.07	.05	-.02
Some candidates talk over one's head	.73	-.10	.09	.04	.06
They hardly have anything to say	.41	.06	-.01	-.06	-.60

Highest Factor Loadings are underlined

Table 6

Campaign Gratifications Only

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Stands on issues	.89	.13	.05
Personal qualities	.35	.21	-.15
Help make up mind	.55	.32	.15
Judge who is likely to win	.04	.21	.28
Candidate's strong points	.20	.36	.19
Give something to talk about	-.08	.09	.74
Enjoy excitement	-.05	.02	.52
What would do if elected	.21	.37	.21
Use in political discussions	.22	.10	.47
Get information which agrees with your position	.13	.49	.30
Judge candidates' weak points	.22	.83	.12

Highest factor loadings are underlined

Table 7

Scale Correlations

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1 Safety	xx														
2 Informal interaction	*:33	xx													
3 Localism	:17	*:42	xx												
4 Anonymity	-.07	*:27	.07	xx											
5 Not bothered by noise	.07	-.09	:20	.00	xx										
6 Neighboring preference	.06	*:38	.08	-.17	-.06	xx									
7 Newspaper information	-.03	*:26	*:25	-.12	.02	-.15	xx								
8 Newspaper entertainment	.09	.01	.09	-.04	-.04	.03	.10	xx							
9 TV information	-.03	-.02	.10	-.00	.05	-.00	.02	-.01	xx						
10 TV action shows	.12	.02	.04	:18	-.06	.07	-:20	.12	*:31	xx					
11 TV light entertainment	.04	-.17	.04	-.10	.04	.01	-.15	*:34	*:25	:21	xx				
12 Surveillance	.06	:21	.17	.04	*:23	.09	*:35	*:20	.07	.04	-.07	xx			
13 Reinforcement	.03	.17	.01	-:19	-.11	.17	.17	*:32	-.00	.03	-.03	*:43	xx		
14 Excitement	*:30	.12	:21	-.15	:18	.05	.*20	.10	.04	-.12	.03	.08	**29	xx	
15 Media avoidance	-.07	-.10	-:19	.13	-.12	.17	*:29	*:28	-.02	*:27	.10	-.11	.05	-.06	xx

*p≤.05
**p≤.01

TABLE 8

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PARTICIPANTS AND NON-PARTICIPANTS

Variable	Participants' Mean	Non-participants' Mean	Degrees of Freedom	t value	Probability
Involvement in Local Politics	2.065	.957	92	4.763	.000
Involvement in Presidential Politics	1.761	.447	92	5.662	-0-
Safety	15.609	14.277	92	1.975	.051
Informal Interaction	12.391	10.617	92	1.982	.050
Localism	11.565	9.911	90	2.712	.008
Days read newspaper	6.178	5.000	89	2.041	.010
Newspaper Information Factor	14.533	12.422	89	5.093	.000
Hours watch television	2.133	3.389	89	3.009	.000
Television Action Factor	7.025	8.319	90	2.859	.005
Avoidance of Politics on Television	9.848	12.872	92	4.554	.000
Age	2.870	2.319	92	2.648	.010
Length of Residence	28.614	17.064	90	2.470	.020
Education	15.500	13.478	92	2.872	.004

TABLE 8
(continued)

Variable	Participants' Mean	Non-participants' Mean	Degrees of Freedom	t value	Probability
Ease of access	1.422	2.310	73	3.699	.000
Only committed people attend	2.630	3.289	90	2.963	.004
Parties make it difficult to find caucuses	2.065	2.533	90	2.245	.027

TABLE 9

CONTINGENCY TABLES

"How much attention would you say you have been paying to reports about the Presidential primaries?"

	Some	A lot	Total	
Participants	14	29	43	
Non-Participants	24	17	41	x^2=4.717, 1 d.f., probability=.0299
Total	38	46	84	

"Do you read any news magazines regularly?"

	Yes	No	Total	
Participants	29	17	46	
Non-Participants	14	33	47	x^2=9.048, 1 d.f., probability=.0013
Total	43	50	93	

TABLE 10

PREDICTORS OF CAUCUS ATTENDANCE

Predictor Set	Variable	Multiple R	R^2	Change in R^2	Beta
1. Television uses	Television avoidance factor	.40	.16	.16	-.31
	Hours watch television	.48	.23	.07	-.22
	Television action factor	.49	.24	.01	-.12
2. Newspaper uses	Newspaper information factor	.46	.22	.22	.42
	Days read newspaper	.48	.23	.01	.10
3. Sense of Community	Localism	.28	.08	.08	.21
	Safety	.32	.10	.02	.13
	Informal interaction	.33	.11	.01	.09
4. Media use variables	Newspaper information factor	.47	.22	.22	.31
	Television avoidance factor	.56	.31	.09	-.27
	Television action factor	.58	.33	.02	-.10
	Hours watch television	.59	.34	.01	-.12
	Days read newspaper	.59	.35	.01	.09
5. Caucus Attitudes	Ease of access	.41	.17	.17	-.35
	Only committed People Attend	.48	.23	.06	-.11

TABLE 10

(continued)

Predictor Set	Variable	Multiple R	R^2	Change in R^2	Beta
6. Demographics	Education	.37	.14	.14	.37
	Length of Residence	.49	.24	.10	.32
	Age	.49	.24	.00	.02
7. Political Activity	Involvement in Presidential Politics	.52	.27	.27	.41
	Involvement in Local Politics	.56	.31	.04	.23

TABLE 11

EDUCATION REGRESSION

Heirarchical design

Inclusion Level	Variable	Multiple R	R^2	Change in R^2	Beta
ONE	Education	.37	.14	.14	.12
TWO	Involvement in Local Politics	.49	.24	.10	.10
	Involvement in Presidential Politics	.59	.35	.11	.35
THREE	TV action Factor	.61	.37	.02	-.10
	TV avoidance Factor	.62	.38	.02	-.17
	Hours watch TV	.63	.40	.01	-.10

Step-Wise Design

Variable	Multiple R	R^2	Change in R^2	Beta
Involvement in presidential politics	.52	.27	.27	.35
TV avoidance factor	.58	.34	.07	-.16
Hours watch TV	.60	.37	.03	-.10
Involvement in local politics	.61	.38	.01	.09
Education	.62	.39	.01	.12
TV action factor	.63	.40	.01	-.10

TABLE 12

BEST PREDICTORS OF CAUCUS ATTENDANCE

Variable	Multiple R	R^2	Change in R^2	Beta
Involvement in presidential politics	.52	.27	.27	.30
Ease of access	.62	.39	.12	-.17
Only committed people attend	.67	.45	.06	-.20
Newspaper information factor	.71	.50	.05	.16
TV avoidance factor	.73	.53	.03	-.10
Length of residence	.74	.55	.02	.18
Involvement in local politics	.75	.56	.01	.11
Hours watch TV	.76	.57	.01	-.09
Education	.76	.58	.01	.07